

Limit on the Two-Photon Production of the Glueball Candidate $f_J(2220)$ at the Cornell Electron Storage Ring

R. Godang,¹ K. Kinoshita,¹ I. C. Lai,¹ P. Pomianowski,¹ S. Schrenk,¹ G. Bonvicini,² D. Cinabro,² R. Greene,² L. P. Perera,² G. J. Zhou,² B. Barish,³ M. Chadha,³ S. Chan,³ G. Eigen,³ J. S. Miller,³ C. O'Grady,³ M. Schmidtler,³ J. Urheim,³ A. J. Weinstein,³ F. Würthwein,³ D. M. Asner,⁴ D. W. Bliss,⁴ W. S. Brower,⁴ G. Masek,⁴ H. P. Paar,⁴ S. Prell,⁴ M. Sivertz,⁴ V. Sharma,⁴ J. Gronberg,⁵ T. S. Hill,⁵ R. Kutschke,⁵ D. J. Lange,⁵ S. Menary,⁵ R. J. Morrison,⁵ H. N. Nelson,⁵ T. K. Nelson,⁵ C. Qiao,⁵ J. D. Richman,⁵ D. Roberts,⁵ A. Ryd,⁵ M. S. Witherell,⁵ R. Balest,⁶ B. H. Behrens,⁶ K. Cho,⁶ W. T. Ford,⁶ H. Park,⁶ P. Rankin,⁶ J. Roy,⁶ J. G. Smith,⁶ J. P. Alexander,⁷ C. Bebek,⁷ B. E. Berger,⁷ K. Berkelman,⁷ K. Bloom,⁷ D. G. Cassel,⁷ H. A. Cho,⁷ D. M. Coffman,⁷ D. S. Crowcroft,⁷ M. Dickson,⁷ P. S. Drell,⁷ K. M. Ecklund,⁷ R. Ehrlich,⁷ R. Elia,⁷ A. D. Foland,⁷ P. Gaidarev,⁷ R. S. Galik,⁷ B. Gittelman,⁷ S. W. Gray,⁷ D. L. Hartill,⁷ B. K. Heltsley,⁷ P. I. Hopman,⁷ J. Kandaswamy,⁷ N. Katayama,⁷ P. C. Kim,⁷ D. L. Kreinick,⁷ T. Lee,⁷ Y. Liu,⁷ G. S. Ludwig,⁷ J. Masui,⁷ J. Mevissen,⁷ N. B. Mistry,⁷ C. R. Ng,⁷ E. Nordberg,⁷ M. Ogg,^{7,*} J. R. Patterson,⁷ D. Peterson,⁷ D. Riley,⁷ A. Soffer,⁷ C. Ward,⁷ M. Athanas,⁸ P. Avery,⁸ C. D. Jones,⁸ M. Lohner,⁸ C. Prescott,⁸ J. Yelton,⁸ J. Zheng,⁸ G. Brandenburg,⁹ R. A. Briere,⁹ Y. S. Gao,⁹ D. Y.-J. Kim,⁹ R. Wilson,⁹ H. Yamamoto,⁹ T. E. Browder,¹⁰ F. Li,¹⁰ Y. Li,¹⁰ J. L. Rodriguez,¹⁰ T. Bergfeld,¹¹ B. I. Eisenstein,¹¹ J. Ernst,¹¹ G. E. Gladding,¹¹ G. D. Gollin,¹¹ R. M. Hans,¹¹ E. Johnson,¹¹ I. Karliner,¹¹ M. A. Marsh,¹¹ M. Palmer,¹¹ M. Selen,¹¹ J. J. Thaler,¹¹ K. W. Edwards,¹² A. Bellerive,¹³ R. Janicek,¹³ D. B. MacFarlane,¹³ K. W. McLean,¹³ P. M. Patel,¹³ A. J. Sadoff,¹⁴ R. Ammar,¹⁵ P. Baringer,¹⁵ A. Bean,¹⁵ D. Besson,¹⁵ D. Coppage,¹⁵ C. Darling,¹⁵ R. Davis,¹⁵ N. Hancock,¹⁵ S. Kotov,¹⁵ I. Kravchenko,¹⁵ N. Kwak,¹⁵ S. Anderson,¹⁶ Y. Kubota,¹⁶ M. Lattery,¹⁶ S. J. Lee,¹⁶ J. J. O'Neill,¹⁶ S. Patton,¹⁶ R. Poling,¹⁶ T. Riehle,¹⁶ V. Savinov,¹⁶ A. Smith,¹⁶ M. S. Alam,¹⁷ S. B. Athar,¹⁷ Z. Ling,¹⁷ A. H. Mahmood,¹⁷ H. Severini,¹⁷ S. Timm,¹⁷ F. Wappler,¹⁷ A. Anastassov,¹⁸ S. Blinov,^{18,†} J. E. Duboscq,¹⁸ K. D. Fisher,¹⁸ D. Fujino,^{18,‡} R. Fulton,¹⁸ K. K. Gan,¹⁸ T. Hart,¹⁸ K. Honscheid,¹⁸ H. Kagan,¹⁸ R. Kass,¹⁸ J. Lee,¹⁸ M. B. Spencer,¹⁸ M. Sung,¹⁸ A. Undrus,^{18,†} R. Wanke,¹⁸ A. Wolf,¹⁸ M. M. Zoeller,¹⁸ B. Nemati,¹⁹ S. J. Richichi,¹⁹ W. R. Ross,¹⁹ P. Skubic,¹⁹ M. Wood,¹⁹ M. Bishai,²⁰ J. Fast,²⁰ E. Gerndt,²⁰ J. W. Hinson,²⁰ N. Menon,²⁰ D. H. Miller,²⁰ E. I. Shibata,²⁰ I. P. J. Shipsey,²⁰ M. Yurko,²⁰ L. Gibbons,²¹ S. D. Johnson,²¹ Y. Kwon,²¹ S. Roberts,²¹ E. H. Thorndike,²¹ C. P. Jessop,²² K. Lingel,²² H. Marsiske,²² M. L. Perl,²² S. F. Schaffner,²² D. Ugolini,²² R. Wang,²² X. Zhou,²² T. E. Coan,²³ V. Fadeyev,²³ I. Korolkov,²³ Y. Maravin,²³ I. Narsky,²³ V. Shelkov,²³ J. Staeck,²³ R. Stroynowski,²³ I. Volobouev,²³ J. Ye,²³ M. Artuso,²⁴ A. Efimov,²⁴ F. Frasconi,²⁴ M. Gao,²⁴ M. Goldberg,²⁴ D. He,²⁴ S. Kopp,²⁴ G. C. Moneti,²⁴ R. Mountain,²⁴ S. Schuh,²⁴ T. Skwarnicki,²⁴ S. Stone,²⁴ G. Viehhauser,²⁴ X. Xing,²⁴ J. Bartelt,²⁵ S. E. Csorna,²⁵ V. Jain,²⁵ and S. Marka²⁵

(CLEO Collaboration)

¹Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia 24061²Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan 48202³California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125⁴University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093⁵University of California, Santa Barbara, California 93106⁶University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309-0390⁷Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853⁸University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611⁹Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138¹⁰University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822¹¹University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, Illinois 61801¹²Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1S 5B6,
and the Institute of Particle Physics, Montréal, Québec, Canada¹³McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3A 2T8,
and the Institute of Particle Physics, Montréal, Québec, Canada¹⁴Ithaca College, Ithaca, New York 14850¹⁵University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045¹⁶University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455¹⁷State University of New York at Albany, Albany, New York 12222¹⁸The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210¹⁹University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73019




FIG. 1. $m(\pi^+\pi^-)_1$ versus $m(\pi^+\pi^-)_2$ for data. Each event has two entries corresponding to transposition of the labels $1 \leftrightarrow 2$.

$K_s K_s$ mass resolution, $\sigma_{K_s K_s}$, of 9 MeV for $m_{K_s K_s}$ near 2.23 GeV. The net selection efficiencies are 0.07 and 0.15 for pure helicity 0 and pure helicity ± 2 , respectively [16].

We construct a $K_s K_s$ mass distribution for those events that satisfy all of the selection criteria. In Fig. 2, we display the data for the $K_s K_s$ mass region of interest. No enhancement at the $f_J(2220)$ mass is observed.

To determine the number of $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow f_J(2220)$ events, we count the number of events within a region that has been optimized based on the line shape of the $f_J(2220)$.




FIG. 2. $K_s K_s$ mass distribution (GeV) observed in data near the $f_J(2220)$ mass. The vertical arrows delineate the signal region in which events are counted. The solid line is the sum of a fit to the background and the signal line shape for central values of the resonance parameters, $m_{f_J} = 2.234$ GeV and $\Gamma_{f_J} = 19$ MeV, corresponding to the observed 95% C.L. upper limit of 4.9 signal events.

We convolve a detector resolution function with a Breit-Wigner resonance to determine the expected shape. This line shape is used to determine the signal region size that maximizes ε^2/b , to maximize the sensitivity to observe the resonance, where ε is the fraction of the area under the signal line shape that falls within the region, and b is the estimated number of background events determined as described below. For $\sigma_{K_s K_s} = 9$ MeV and $\Gamma_{f_J} = 19$ MeV this window is ± 18 MeV, for which $\varepsilon = 70\%$.

To obtain a background shape, we fit the $m_{K_s K_s}$ distribution with a linear function from 2.05 to 2.35 GeV, excluding a ± 40 MeV region centered on the expected mass. From this we extract an average background of 1.8 ± 0.3 events per 10 MeV for $m_{f_J} = 2.234$ GeV. Within the signal region determined for the central values of the resonance parameters, we count four events. Having observed four events while expecting 6.5 from background, we use the standard Particle Data Group (PDG) technique of extracting an upper limit for a Poisson distribution with background [17] to extract an upper limit of 4.9 signal events at the 95% C.L.

To determine the value of $(\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma} \mathcal{B}_{K_s K_s})_{f_J(2220)}$, we assume that $f_J(2220)$ is produced incoherently with the background. We scale the branching fraction and partial width used in the Monte Carlo generator by the ratio of the upper limit on the number of data events to the number of selected Monte Carlo events, and by the ratio of Monte Carlo to data luminosities,

$$\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^{\text{data}} \mathcal{B}_{K_s K_s}^{\text{data}} = \frac{n^{\text{data}}}{n^{\text{MC}}} \frac{L^{\text{MC}}}{L^{\text{data}}} \Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^{\text{MC}} \mathcal{B}_{K_s K_s}^{\text{MC}}. \quad (1)$$

The two-photon partial width, $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}$, can be expressed as the sum of two components, $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^{2,0}$ and $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^{2,2}$, the two-photon partial widths associated with helicity 0 and helicity ± 2 projections, respectively. We must differentiate between the two partial widths because the detection efficiencies for the two allowed helicity projections are not the same due to their different final state angular distributions. Under the assumption that the ratio of $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^{2,2} \cdot \Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^{2,0}$ is 6:1 [18,19] based on Clebsch-Gordon coefficients, we obtain the result

$$(\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma} \mathcal{B}_{K_s K_s})_{f_J(2220)} \leq 1.4 \text{ eV}, \quad 95\% \text{ C.L.} \quad (2)$$

The limit is slightly stronger, 1.3 eV, if $J = 4$ is assumed for the resonance [20]. The limits include uncertainties associated with systematics which will be discussed below.

Without making any assumption about the ratio of partial widths of the two helicity projections, we can set a 95% C.L. functional limit for $J = 2$,

$$(0.52\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^{2,0} + 1.08\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^{2,2}) \mathcal{B}_{K_s K_s} \leq 1.4 \text{ eV}, \quad 95\% \text{ C.L.} \quad (3)$$

The ratio of the partial width coefficients in Eq. (3) is given by the ratio of efficiencies for helicity 0 to helicity ± 2 . The overall normalization is set to be consistent with Eq. (2).

Systematic uncertainties have been included in determining these upper limits using a Monte Carlo program.

We estimate the following systematic uncertainties in the overall detector efficiency: 8% due to triggering, 7% due to tracking, and 7% due to simulation of selection criteria. The total systematic uncertainty associated with efficiency is 13%. We estimate the systematic uncertainty in the background normalization to be 16%. The uncertainty associated with the $f_J(2220)$ resonance parameters is also included by statistically sampling measurement results when varying these resonance parameters up to ± 2.5 standard deviations [21]. The window selection size is optimized for each case of varied resonance parameters. For a variation of -1 and $+1$ standard deviations in the resonance width the window sizes are ± 13 and ± 26 MeV, respectively.

We have verified our technique by using the same Monte Carlo simulation and analysis approach to measure the two-photon partial width of the $f'_2(1525)$. The $f'_2(1525)$ measurement is a sound test as the $f'_2(1525)$ produces a prominent peak in the $K_s K_s$ mass distribution and has quantum numbers consistent with those expected for the $f_J(2220)$. We measure a value for the product of the partial width and the $K_s K_s$ branching fraction that is within 1 standard deviation [22] of the PDG central value.

The small value of the $(\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma} \mathcal{B}_{K_s K_s})_{f_J(2220)}$ upper limit obtained from this analysis supports the identification of the $f_J(2220)$ as a glueball. We can make a more quantitative statement by calculating the stickiness of the resonance. Stickiness is a useful glueball figure of merit that is a measure of color charge relative to electric charge. The definition of stickiness is [10]

$$S_X \equiv N_l \left(\frac{m_X}{k_{\psi \rightarrow \gamma X}} \right)^{2l+1} \frac{\Gamma(J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma X)}{\Gamma(X \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)} \sim \frac{|\langle X | gg \rangle|^2}{|\langle X | \gamma\gamma \rangle|^2}. \quad (4)$$

The parameter $k_{\psi \rightarrow \gamma X} = (m_\psi^2 - m_X^2)/(2m_\psi)$ is the energy of the photon from a radiative decay of the J/ψ at rest. The phase-space term removes the mass dependence. The quantum number l indicates the angular momentum between the initial state gauge bosons. N_l is a normalization parameter defined so that the stickinesses of the $f_2(1270)$ ($l = 0$) is 1. To determine the value of N_l we use the mass, two-photon width, and radiative J/ψ decay branching fraction of the $f_2(1270)$ given by the PDG [17].

To calculate a lower limit on the stickiness, we combine our upper limit for $(\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma} \mathcal{B}_{K_s K_s})_{f_J(2220)}$ from Eq. (2) with a value for $\Gamma(J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma f_J(2220)) \mathcal{B}(f_J(2220) \rightarrow K_s K_s)$ obtained by averaging [23] results from Mark III [1] and BES [2]. The $\mathcal{B}(J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma f_J(2220)) \mathcal{B}(f_J(2220) \rightarrow K_s K_s)$ branching fraction so determined is $(2.2 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-5}$. From this we calculate a lower limit on stickiness of 76 at the 95% C.L. for the $f_J(2220)$. The statistical and systematic uncertainties of the inputs, including the uncertainty on the J/ψ branching fraction, and the $f_J(2220)$ resonance parameters [24], are incorporated into this limit through a Monte Carlo program.

The observation of the $f_J(2220)$ in production modes consistent with those expected for glueballs has made it a

glueball candidate. With the limit on $(\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma} \mathcal{B}_{K_s K_s})_{f_J(2220)}$ presented here we are able to make a much stronger statement. In particular, it is difficult to explain how a $q\bar{q}$ meson, even pure $s\bar{s}$, could have such a large stickiness. In general, explanations that give small two-photon partial widths give small radiative J/ψ decay branching fractions. Radial and angular excitations fall into this category. A $J = 4$ resonance is not ruled out experimentally. However, under the assumption $J = 4$, the limit on the product of the two-photon width and $K_s K_s$ branching fraction is slightly more stringent, and the phase-space term to which stickiness is proportional becomes very large. A small two-photon width due to a cancellation involving specific values of the singlet-octet mixing and the ratio of matrix elements is possible but unlikely.

In this Letter we have presented the results of the search for $f_J(2220)$ production in two-photon interactions. We have reported a very small upper limit for $(\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma} \mathcal{B}_{K_s K_s})_{f_J(2220)}$. The minimum stickiness obtained from the two-photon width upper limit is difficult to understand in the context of a $q\bar{q}$ resonance, and should be considered as strong evidence that the $f_J(2220)$ is a glueball.

We gratefully acknowledge the effort of the CESR staff in providing us with excellent luminosity and running conditions. We thank M. Chanowitz for his thoughtful comments. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Department of Energy, the Heisenberg Foundation, the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and the A. P. Sloan Foundation.

*Permanent address: University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712.

†Permanent address: BINP, RU-630090 Novosibirsk, Russia.

‡Permanent address: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA 94551.

- [1] Mark III Collaboration, R. Baltrusaitis *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 107 (1986).
- [2] BES Collaboration, J.Z. Bai *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3502 (1996).
- [3] GAMS Collaboration, D. Alde *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **177**, 120 (1986).
- [4] LASS Collaboration, D. Aston *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **215**, 199 (1988).
- [5] MSS Collaboration, B.V. Bolonkin *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B309**, 426 (1988).
- [6] C. Michael, hep-ph/9605243.
- [7] C. Morningstar and M. Peardon, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **53**, 917 (1997).
- [8] D.W. Bliss, Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, San Diego, 1997.
- [9] ARGUS Collaboration, H. Albrecht *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **48**, 183 (1990).

- [10] M. Chanowitz, in *Proceedings of the VIth International Workshop on Photon-Photon Collisions, 1984* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1995).
- [11] CLEO Collaboration, Y. Kubota *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **320**, 66 (1992).
- [12] D. Rubin, in *Proceedings of the 1995 Particle Accelerator Conference* (IEEE, New York, 1995), Vol. 1, p. 481.
- [13] V.M. Budnev, I.F. Ginzburg, G.V. Meledin, and V.G. Serbo, Phys. Rep. **15C**, 181 (1975).
- [14] We average the mass and width measurements for the four different modes reported by BES and the two modes reported by Mark III. We assume that the systematic uncertainties within an experiment are completely correlated and the systematic uncertainties between experiments are uncorrelated.
- [15] R. Brun *et al.*, "GEANT, Detector Description and Simulation Tool," CERN Program Library Long Writeup W5013, 1993.
- [16] If $J = 4$ is assumed the net selection efficiencies are 0.08 and 0.09 for pure helicity 0 and pure helicity ± 2 , respectively.
- [17] Particle Data Group, R.M. Barnett *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 1 (1996).
- [18] M. Poppe, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **1**, 545 (1986).
- [19] H. Kolanoski and P. Zerwas, in *High Energy Electron-Positron Physics* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1988).
- [20] Although the efficiency for a $J = 4$ resonance is lower than for a $J = 2$ resonance, the production rate is proportional to $2J + 1$. Consequently, the limit on the product of the two-photon width and branching fraction is more stringent for $J = 4$.
- [21] The limit on $(\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma} \mathcal{B}_{K_s K_s})_{f_J(2220)}$ is 1.3 eV if evaluated at the most likely values of the resonance parameters.
- [22] We measure the two-photon width of the $f_2'(1525)$ to be (84 ± 8) eV (statistical uncertainty only) as compared to the PDG value of (97 ± 16) eV [17]. We have not performed a study of systematic uncertainties for this measurement.
- [23] We form an average $K_s K_s$ branching fraction by combining the $K_s K_s$ with the $K^+ K^-$ measurements. We treat systematic uncertainties as 100% correlated within an experiment and uncorrelated between experiments.
- [24] When evaluated at the most likely values of the resonance parameters, we obtain a stickiness of 82.